

United Illuminating, New Haven, Conn., (426), charitable contributions, \$58,655; (930), miscellaneous, \$66,809.

Utah Power & Light, Salt Lake City, Utah, (426), 70 miscellaneous donations, \$40,463.88; (426), 6 minor miscellaneous, \$2,709.06; (930), minor miscellaneous, \$38,202.

Virginia Electric & Power, Richmond, Va., (426), donations, \$193,819; (426), 13 minor items, \$3,084; (930) other, \$45,168.

West Penn Power, Greensburg, Pa., (426), donations, \$68,252; (930), minor, \$28,133.

West Texas Utilities, Abilene, Tex., (426), donations, \$41,476.25; (930), miscellaneous, \$49,968.90.

Western Light & Telephone, Dodge City, Kans., (930), donations (along with stationery, printing, and miscellaneous, \$58,696.13.

Western Massachusetts Electric, West Springfield, Mass., (426), miscellaneous, \$2,150; (930), miscellaneous, \$84,824.76.

Wisconsin Electric Power, Milwaukee, Wis., (426), donations, \$250,937.80; (930), miscellaneous, \$53,944.26.

Wisconsin Michigan Power, Appleton, Wis., (426), donations, \$16,550; (930), miscellaneous, \$14,024.12.

Wisconsin Power & Light, Madison, Wis., (426), donations, \$23,095; (930) miscellaneous, \$22,155.

Wisconsin Public Service Corp., Milwaukee, Wis., (426), donations for charitable, religious, and educational purposes, \$42,530.20; (930), other items less than \$25,000, \$35,619.

EXHIBIT 2 PETITION

We, the undersigned owners of the Hill County Electric Cooperative, Inc., wish to have the following information itemized and included in the annual financial report, May 19, 1964:

1. All traveling expenses of our manager, including meals, tickets, liquor, lodging, rented transportation, public relations expenses, and annual wages.
2. All individual traveling expenses of each board member.
3. Attorneys' wages, legal advice, and other attorney expenses.
4. Interest on all money loaned out to savings and loan company.

We also want the following carried out by the Hill County Electric Cooperative, Inc., and the Triangle Telephone Cooperative:

1. All new vehicles put up for bid.
2. Insurance put up for bid.
3. No advertising of Hill County Electric or Triangle Telephone Cooperatives.
4. No promoting of Federal, State, or local programs.
5. No more breakfasts for businessmen paid for by the Hill County Electric or Triangle Telephone Cooperatives.
6. No prizes donated by the Hill County Electric or Triangle Telephone Cooperatives to any organizations or individuals or at the annual meetings.
7. Instead of furnishing dinners at annual meetings, we recommend a substantial amount be deducted on the following month's bill for each family represented.
8. Get rid of private plane. Limit rental of planes for use by manager except as OK'd by directors.
9. We recommend the convention expenses be limited to not more than two directors and the manager, and the directors to be alternated.
10. All regular or special board meetings shall be advertised in the local paper.
11. We recommend that all meetings be opened with a pledge of allegiance to the American flag.

INCREASED DOMESTIC SUGARBEET QUOTAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some days ago, the distinguished Senator

from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] introduced a bill to increase the production of domestic sugarbeets.

At that time, he asked permission to have the bill lay on the desk for a week, I believe, for the purpose of securing additional cosponsors among his colleagues, if they so desired.

When he did so, I went to the desk. I asked that my name be listed as a cosponsor. I found out today that my name is not on that bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added on S. 2657, a bill to increase the production of domestic sugarbeets, which bill was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTLEMENT OF THE PANAMA CANAL CRISIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend and congratulate the President of the United States for the great performance of statesmanship that he has rendered in connection with the settlement of the Panama crisis, at least settlement to the point that an agreement has been reached for a procedure that will lead to the necessary diplomatic relations and that will make possible a free and a sound settlement of the differences that have developed between Panama and the United States.

I am sure, since representatives of the press were in the Cabinet room at the time, that I violate no matter of privilege when I say that I never expected as a country lawyer from faraway Oregon, to sit in the Cabinet Room of the White House and hear a President of the United States call on the long distance telephone and talk with the President of another country.

It is something that a man will talk to his grandchildren about. I sat there this afternoon and listened to our great President represent the people of this country in a manner so magnificent that thrills went up and down my spine which are experienced only on those rare occasions when a person knows that he is observing or witnessing something that is of thrilling importance to him and to others.

I tarried afterward with the majority leader and other Senators and listened to the President read his statement announcing to the country and to the world that successful arrangements had been made through the intervention of the Ambassadors of the Organization of American States leading to a resolution of the procedural problems that have confronted us in respect to getting on with the Panamanian problem.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I wish to state that the President's final position on the matter was not only his original position, but obviously was the position of President Kennedy. As I think and have always said when I discussed it in the Senate, it was made crystal clear in that great release of June 13, 1962, when the

communique was released from the White House signed by President Kennedy and President Chiari of Panama. The communique stated in effect that when two friendly nations such as the United States and Panama find themselves in disagreement over issues, they have a clear obligation to resolve the disagreement. These two Presidents then pledged themselves to carry out that obligation to proceed without delay to enter into the necessary diplomatic conversations leading to a peaceful settlement of those differences. That is exactly the position President Johnson has taken. The President of Panama and his officials and his ambassadors are deserving of the same compliment, tribute, and congratulations that I am paying to President Johnson.

With the appointment of the Special Ambassador, as announced by President Johnson in that long-distance telephone conversation to the President of Panama—I refer to Mr. Robert Anderson—to be our Special Ambassador to carry on our negotiations in regard to the problems involved in these discussions, I am sure we shall be represented by an exceedingly able man who is very familiar with the problems of Panama. I also congratulate the President of the United States on that appointment.

Mr. President, I think it is good to see this ray of international sunshine among the rather heavy clouds of these days. I believe that ray of sunshine will brighten the skies, and the clouds will more and more disappear, as a result of the great statesmanship which President Johnson has displayed in connection with the Panama crisis.

In my opinion, two others deserve our compliments, too. One is Ambassador Bunker, the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States. He has done a magnificent job for many, many weeks, as, to my knowledge, he has worked unbelievable long hours with Ambassador Moreno, the Special Ambassador of Panama, in connection with this matter.

In fact, I have been of the opinion that the position our Ambassador has taken for many weeks has been a sound one.

It is interesting, Mr. President, to find, when we come to study the language set forth in today's announcement—which we shall read in the newspapers published tomorrow, that, in my judgment, its meaning is identical with that of the language which Ambassador Bunker and Ambassador Moreno suggested some weeks ago; but it was necessary to clarify that language by the discussions which have ensued. President Johnson's calm, mild, but determined position—that we are going to proceed on the basis of equality with the Panamanians, that we are going to proceed on the basis of first a restoration of diplomatic relationships, and that we are going to proceed without any commitments in advance—has prevailed. Thus, President Johnson has made a great record. I congratulate him, and I also congratulate Ambassador Bunker.

In my opinion, the third man who deserves great credit in connection with this specific item is the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs,

April 3

Thomas Mann. He, too, deserves our expression of gratitude for the careful and thorough work he has done in connection with the Panamanian issue.

The same also goes for the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. He and I disagree on many matters, but we do not disagree on this one. Whenever I agree with a man on one matter—no matter how much I may disagree with him on others—I am always glad to have the privilege and the opportunity to express my point of agreement with him. So I think Secretary Rusk deserves the thanks of all the people of the United States for his excellent service as Secretary of State, in connection with the Panamanian matter.

THE NEW PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express my high compliments to the President of the United States, in connection with the statement which appears in today's newspapers in connection with the developments in Brazil. The article which I wish to have printed in the RECORD is an Associated Press dispatch by Lewis Gulick. The headline is: "L.B.J. Sends Warm Note to Mazzilli."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L.B.J. SENDS WARM NOTE TO MAZZILLI

(By Lewis Gulick)

President Johnson last night sent his warmest "good wishes" to Ranieri Mazzilli, newly installed as president of Brazil after a military coup ousted Joao Goulart.

Accepting without question the legitimacy of Mazzilli's ascent from the presidency of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, Mr. Johnson told him:

"The American people have watched with anxiety the political and economic difficulties through which your great nation has been passing, and have admired the resolute will of the Brazilian community to resolve these difficulties within the framework of constitutional democracy and without civil strife."

The presidential message made no mention of Goulart, deposed by the military because of his leftist leanings. The message concluded:

"The relations of friendship and cooperation between our two governments and peoples are a great historical legacy for us both and a precious asset in the interest of peace and prosperity and liberty in this hemisphere and in the whole world. I look forward to the continued strengthening of those relations and to our intensified cooperation in the interests of economic progress and social justice for all and of hemispheric and world peace."

The White House release of Mr. Johnson's message was in line with earlier, unofficial word that the U.S. Government is pleased by the removal of Goulart, in whose government the Communists had been playing an increasingly important role. The State Department said normal United States-Brazilian relations were continuing.

Press Officer Robert J. McCloskey declined to answer most inquiries about the revolt that deposed Goulart. But he did say:

"I know of no change in our relations" with the country.

The \$30-million-a-year U.S. aid program to Brazil will be continued.

U.S. authorities had become increasingly displeased with what was regarded as growing Goulart involvement with the Reds. It also has been felt in Washington that Goulart failed to put through effective reforms needed to curb Brazil's runaway inflation, promote development and raise living standards for dissatisfied masses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here, again, President Johnson has acted with the same great care, calmness, and deliberation that have characterized his other actions; and he deserves our thanks for the note he sent to the new President of Brazil.

I wish to make very clear that I can testify, on the basis of such knowledge as I have—and I think the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were kept thoroughly briefed on all details of the developments in Brazil—that the United States in no way intervened or was responsible in any way for the action which occurred in Brazil. I am convinced that the developments there were completely Brazilian; and they were long in the making.

In the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee we have discussed this matter many, many times, and have expressed our concern over the developing thunderheads in the foreign-policy skies over Brazil. We have known for some time that Communists or, certainly, those who were advocating Communist policies were infiltrating themselves into the administration of Goulart. That was of great concern to constitutionalists in Brazil.

Mr. President, the developments in Brazil did not result from action by a military junta or from a coup by a military junta. Instead, the overthrow of the presidency of Brazil resulted from development in which the Congress of Brazil, acting under the Constitution of Brazil, was the guiding force, and was reinforced by a military group which backed up the preservation of the Brazilian constitutional system. Under that constitutional system, Goulart could have remained in Brazil and could have stood trial, so to speak, in connection with charges which would have been placed against him, as provided for under the Brazilian constitutional system. But certainly the Congress of Brazil and the governors and the people of Brazil could not be expected to stand idly by and see their government and its forces gradually, step by step, turned over to a Communist apparatus.

The important point for us to note is that the new President of Brazil—and, under the Brazilian system, he will occupy only temporarily the office of President—is the one next in line under the Brazilian Constitution to occupy the office of the Chief Executive of Brazil. Furthermore, it is also interesting to note that this is not the first time he has occupied that office under somewhat similar circumstances. It is both interesting and, I believe, also somewhat ironic that the new President of Brazil was the temporary President of that country when Quadros resigned and found it convenient to leave Brazil; and Goulart then was next in line, under the constitution. However, there was some opposition to allowing Goulart to assume that

office; and at that time Mr. Mazzilli, the new President of Brazil, insisted that the Brazilian constitutional procedures be followed. In my opinion, that is about all we need to know in regard to Mr. Mazzilli's faith and conviction in regard to the importance of the maintenance of a system of government by law, in keeping with the framework of the constitutional system that is binding upon his country.

In my opinion, President Johnson very appropriately waited until the legal and constitutional system of Brazil had worked its course. When we were notified that the new President of Brazil had taken office, then the warm message of the President of the United States was sent to the new President of Brazil.

It is a beautiful statement, as Senators will see, if they have not already read it. I commend and congratulate my President for that act of statesmanship.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to the next of three additional items on which I intend to comment briefly before I finish. I owe it to myself, and I certainly owe it to many Americans who share my point of view and the point of view of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRAUENING] and others who have expressed themselves in opposition to McNamara's war in South Vietnam in recent weeks, to come to the floor of the Senate immediately after being in the White House and announce again that I stand on every word that I have said on the South Vietnam issue in recent weeks.

I repeat that, in my judgment, there is not the slightest justification for American unilateral action in South Vietnam.

I do not intend to reveal any matter of privilege that occurred at the briefing that we received at the White House in respect to South Vietnam. I learned nothing new from that briefing in regard to McNamara's position in defense of the McNamara war in South Vietnam. I found him as unconvincing today as I have found him from the beginning in regard to the American program in South Vietnam.

I heard not the slightest justification for American unilateral action in South Vietnam, in light of our clear treaty commitments that bear down upon us in connection with the SEATO treaty and in connection with the United Nations. I am not at all impressed with any argument that SEATO is a paper tiger. The signature of the United States is on the SEATO treaty, and the United States has not sought to get the SEATO signatories to join in trying to reach some accommodation in regard to South Vietnam that could bring to an end what I consider to be an unnecessary killing of American boys—yes, the unnecessary killing of human beings, both South Vietnamese and Vietcong.

As a nation pledged to try to settle situations that threaten the peace by peaceful procedures, we at least first ought to have made our record of trying

to resort to the procedures of international law that are made available to us.

With De Gaulle taking the position that he thinks some kind of neutralization—I do not know what he means by it, and we ought to put him on the spot and find out—ought to be substituted in Vietnam for war, we at least ought to be taking the leadership through SEATO, because the signature of France is on that treaty, to find out how he would try to settle it by peaceful procedures.

I repeat, as I shall do from day to day, that the signatories to SEATO are Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, Philippines, Great Britain, France, and the United States.

Is it not interesting and significant that the only country taking action in South Vietnam is the United States? By what right do we set ourselves up and say that we have the right to use unilateral action in South Vietnam?

"Oh," say the apologists for this unjustifiable U.S. action in South Vietnam, "the South Vietnam Government asked us to come in."

East Germany asked Russia to come in. There is as much logic for our being in South Vietnam as there is for the Russians to be in East Germany. There is no logic in either case. Neither country can justify its course of action.

What a glorious opportunity we are miffing to demonstrate to the world that we mean it when we say that we seek to use peaceful means for settling international disputes. How can we possibly justify the unilateral action in South Vietnam with the action we took in regard to Cyprus?

I admit that we had to be pushed into it. I am sorry that we had to be pushed into it. But at least we finally came to realize that since Cyprus was not a member of NATO, we ought to join in a proposal to take the Cyprus issue to the United Nations. And there it is. That is where it ought to have been in the first place.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear again, as I did earlier today, that Senators will never find me standing on the floor of the Senate criticizing American foreign policy without offering what I consider to be constructive affirmative proposals to take the place of a policy that I believe is wrong. We ought to try SEATO first. If we cannot arrive at an accommodation in SEATO that will bring an end to the blood letting in South Vietnam—if our allies to the SEATO treaty do not wish to work out some proposal along lines similar to what De Gaulle has been talking about in general terms—we have the clear duty to take the leadership in urging that the United Nations take up the question of South Vietnam quickly.

What is wrong with that procedure? My ears are open. I have been listening. I have had my hand cupped to my ears for weeks waiting for someone to whisper in my ear. What is wrong with it? We shall never know whether it will work or not until we try.

We owe it to American boys in South Vietnam to try it. We cannot possibly give those American boys in South Viet-

nam the protection to which they are entitled in conducting the McNamara war in South Vietnam the way it is being conducted.

I have talked with Army officers. I have talked with Marine officers. I have talked with Air Force officers. They tell me, "Senator, we are not giving those boys the protection that they ought to have if we are going to send them into an area of combat."

I say to the Senate that we must get the idea out of our heads if we think those boys are military advisers. They are soldiers. They are dying.

Already more than 200 of them have died. I am trying to find out if there are any more. That is why I asked the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the other day to notify the Defense Department that we want a daily report on fatalities. We want a daily report on those who are wounded.

Mr. President, I do not care what angle of the South Vietnam war we examine; we cannot justify it.

The American people, by the rising of tens of thousands of opposing voices every day, are beginning to make their views known to the administration and to the Congress. As the months go by and the unjustifiable killings in South Vietnam continue, we shall hear a repercussion from the American people that will create a din in American public opinion.

I wish to see us take the lead in trying to see if we cannot reach an accommodation. If the result is a United Nations trusteeship, I ask, What is wrong with that?

What is wrong in the United States, with all of our pratings about how we stand for the settling of international disputes by the application of the rule of law? It sounds so good. We have made it sound so good in so many international councils of the world that they have caught up with us. Now they are telling us that they doubt our sincerity about wanting to settle disputes by the application of the rule of law.

Mr. President, we cannot square unilateral American action in South Vietnam with our claim that we want to settle disputes by the adoption of peaceful procedures.

Let us keep in mind that the war in South Vietnam is a civil war. I am still waiting for the Secretary of Defense to give us a scintilla of evidence that there are in South Vietnam any armed soldiers of Red China or North Vietnam or Russia. Equipment, yes. The Vietcong have been buying equipment in North Vietnam, and possibly from China. Equipment manufactured there has been found. But we are in no position to throw stones, for all of the equipment of the South Vietnamese is American equipment.

We become a little excited—and of course I do not condone it—when we find that Castro obtains equipment from Communist enemies of ours. But the fact remains that the foreign soldiers in South Vietnam are Americans—not North Vietnamese, not Red Chinese, not Russian.

I am at a loss to understand why the

United States is conducting unilateral military action in southeast Asia. We have poured \$5½ billion into that area, including \$1½ billion that we granted to France, before France was whipped in Indochina and the French people pulled down a government because they had had enough of the killing of the flower of French manhood.

If there ever was a place, if there ever was an opportunity, for us to try to practice an ideal of the United States, to keep faith with the tenets of an international system of justice through the rule of law, for the settlement of international disputes, this is the place.

Mr. President, I heard not one syllable at the White House this afternoon that causes me to change a single word of the already many speeches I have made on the floor of the Senate on South Vietnam. Senators have just begun to hear them. I have just started to discuss South Vietnam on the floor of the Senate. I shall continue to discuss it and discuss it and discuss it until someone shows me where I am mistaken in my position that we ought to stop our unilateral action in South Vietnam, which is leading to the unjustifiable killing of American boys, and try to work out, within the spirit, the purpose, the objectives—and, yes, the language—of the United Nations Charter a peaceful settlement of a dispute that threatens the peace in southeast Asia.

AID TO INDIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to another matter.

My good friend Chester Bowles delivered himself of a speech yesterday at the Press Club. I ask unanimous consent that the article in today's Washington Post by Murrey Marder, entitled "Bowles Cites Gap in Aid Knowledge," be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWLES CITES GAP IN AID KNOWLEDGE

(By Murrey Marder)

A great communications gap has left much of Congress and the public unaware of the impact of American foreign aid, Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles said yesterday.

While there has been grumbling about the foreign aid increases, Bowles said, the United States has shown an "extraordinary, growing ability" to make its overseas spending effective.

Bowles, outspoken liberal Democrat who was eased out of a post as Under Secretary of State and is now serving a second tour of duty in India after a 10-year gap, is in Washington for consultation. Still unquenchably enthusiastic in presenting his viewpoint, Bowles vigorously argued the case for foreign aid before a National Press Club luncheon audience.

India's 450 million people comprise about one-half of all the recipients of American foreign aid, he noted. Yet in 27 months, he said, only 9 Members of Congress have visited India to grasp the contribution the United States has made to its growth and stability.

FAT-CAT WARNING

Bowles warned against the danger of the United States becoming "a kind of interna-

tional fat cat that can't understand poor people" when "the world is filled with poor people."

But it is foolish, he cautioned, to make foreign aid a quest for "trophies" or "gratitude," even though U.S. prestige in India is very high. Instead, said Bowles, foreign aid serves mutual self-interest in creating "areas of stability" in the world.

Red China's and other Communist nations' failures in agriculture have left deep marks on the Indian outlook, Bowles said.

WOULD BET ON INDIA

"I would certainly bet on India against China" when it comes to building an effective society, Bowles said, even though India's problems are "tremendous."

In India, he said, the "private sector" of development "has to be given a better chance." With a smile, he added, "There are many things that government can't do—the more I stay in government the more I am conscious of it." But in dealing with nations receiving aid, Bowles said, the United States must recognize that "we can't play God."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, our Ambassador to India is a good ambassador. Chester Bowles is one of the greatest diplomats we have. I considered him to be a great Under Secretary of State when he had that position. I am a great supporter of Chester Bowles. But sometimes one can show his friendship best by disagreeing when he thinks a friend has gone wrong. Chester Bowles does great good as our Ambassador to India, but obviously blanket approval of Chester Bowles in regard to foreign aid to India cannot be justified.

Referring to his speech, the article reads:

In India, he said, the "private sector" of development "has to be given a better chance." With a smile, he added, "There are many things that government can't do—the more I stay in government the more I am conscious of it."

To that I say, "Amen." I have been urging that we step up the tempo of using the private segment of our economy to carry out our aid program. When we start doing it, the giveaway feature of the program will be diminished and reduced.

The article continues, in reference to what Ambassador Bowles said:

But in dealing with nations receiving aid, Bowles said, the United States must recognize that "we can't play God."

Catching, is it not? I say to Mr. Bowles that the United States had better recognize that we cannot play Santa Claus. The Santa Claus concept ought to come within the classification of the myths that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] discussed the other day.

To my good friend, Mr. Bowles, I say that the recommendations he has been making for some of the aid—not all of it, but some of the aid—to India is a Santa Claus recommendation.

It is interesting that in the Bowles speech of yesterday he did not even mention several problems with respect to India. He did not mention that the Indians now want a great increase in military aid. The administration plans to go along, if Congress will approve. But this is one vote the administration does not have.

Mr. President, why should I sit in the Senate of the United States and vote for an increase in aid to India?

Mr. Bowles, do you not know they want that aid, not to fight Russia or Red China, but to fight Pakistan? I say to Mr. Bowles that I see no reason why we should build up the military program of India, to put India in a position where she might try to settle her differences with Pakistan through the jungle law of force by way of war, rather than by applying the peaceful procedures of international law and the rule of law and reason in regard to Kashmir.

Basic in the whole problem of military aid to India, Kashmir looms on the horizon. Our Ambassador had better face that fact. If our Ambassador wants to know why there have been some difficulties with certain Senators—and I have already sent him a letter with respect thereto—in regard to military aid to India, it is because of the unsettled Kashmir issue.

I am against military aid to Pakistan, because I have no intention of building up the Pakistanian forces for a war against India. We shall have quite a debate about it as the foreign aid bill reaches the floor of the Senate some months from now.

I wish that our Ambassador, in his speech yesterday at the Press Club, had talked a little about why India wants military aid.

I ask my good Ambassador, "Does anyone believe that if a war breaks out with Russia the military aid we are being asked to give to India will amount to a tinker's worth?" We all know that if such a war breaks out, we shall be in it. We know that it will be a nuclear war, and it will be over quickly. There will not be much left of the participants, but it will be over.

It is not military aid that India needs, but she does need to have us do a better job. That is why I wish to bring in the private segment of the economy, to prepare the seed beds of economic freedom in India so that the economic plight and the standard of living of her people can be raised.

That is the approach we should be making to the problem of foreign aid. Some grant money should be given in India in regard to certain items such as control of malaria, typhus, and cholera; and some help, on a grant basis, should be given in connection with food. We can help to strengthen India, not by a Santa Claus program, but by developing project after project which will strengthen the economy of India for the benefit of the mass of its people.

I wish to make one further point. I can well understand why the Ambassador would not discuss it, but we in the Senate do not have to be diplomats. Let us face it, India has a most serious religious problem, centuries old—older than the United States—which cannot be settled by sending them billions of dollars in aid. Religious strife in India is holding back her progress. I believe the American taxpayers have a right to better protection than they are getting by being asked to play Santa Claus to

India, and pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the country without raising her horizons and her sights to the recognition that certainly in this era, she should proceed internally to solve a civil rights problem of her own. The civil rights problem in India takes the form of religious discrimination against the untouchables. Bad as ours is, theirs is worse.

When I was in India a few years ago, I had lunch with the editors of the two most powerful newspapers there. They thought they were going to give me a bad time about civil rights. There was not much that I could do to defend our failure in the field of civil rights to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America, but I did not intend to sit there and take it from those two editors when I realized that they had a civil rights problem in their own country which made our own problem pale into insignificance.

They went after me in regard to lack of integration in our schools. Of course, I believe it is shocking not to have integrated schools in the United States. But I said, "How do you handle the children of the untouchables?"

One said, "They do not go to school." What an answer. They do not go to school. They do not seek to offer them any educational opportunity.

Goodnaturedly and respectfully, because I was a guest in their country, I tried to point out that they were not in a very good position to be talking about the race problem in the United States.

I said to my Ambassador, "Face up to it. Our taxpayers have a right to ask us to what use this Santa Claus money will be put that you want to give by way of an increased program of aid to India."

I believe that if we are to protect the legitimate interests of our taxpayers, we must take a long, hard look at aid to India.

Mine is one vote to substantially reduce it.

Here is one vote for no military aid whatever to India.

Here is one vote for a reduction in economic aid to India, and insistence that that aid be on a loan basis and on the basis of cost of the use of the money—with an interest rate—on the basis of the projects that will bring economic benefit to the people of India who will be living within the economic shadows of each project.

That is my reply to my good friend Chester Bowles, the Ambassador to India, in connection with the speech that he made to the Press Club yesterday which, judging from the press reports, and judging from what a couple of newsmen told me yesterday, is in line with what he has been writing to some Senators about in his letters, that we should be "upping the ante."

I say: "Mr. Ambassador, you did not sell your bill of goods to me."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator from Oregon knows that in India certain animals are regarded as being